



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mission, we should coöperate as fellow workers in the one grand army of peace, privileged to labor in the grandest of all causes, declaring with Washington that our first wish is that war should be abolished from the face of the earth.

Why the Panama Canal Should Not Be Fortified, but Neutralized.

The following resolution was adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society at their meeting January 3, and copies of it sent to Congress and given to the press of the country :

"Resolved, That the American Peace Society regards the fortification of the Panama Canal as unnecessary, in view of the Hague convention forbidding the bombardment of unfortified coast places, as involving a vast outlay of money needed for the material and moral uplift of our citizens, and as committing the United States to a program of increased military expenditure at a time when we ought to be leading the world in the effort to settle all international disputes by arbitration. We believe that neutralization by international agreement, as in the case of the unfortified Suez Canal, will give us ample guarantee of security, will be an important step towards the neutralization of all international water-ways, and will give the United States a moral leadership in the world-wide movement towards the removal of national misunderstandings and the fostering of international goodwill.

"Resolved, That we call upon all friends of peace to urge immediately upon their Representatives in Congress the passage of a bill for the neutralization of the canal under international guarantee."

Reasons why the Canal Should Not Be Fortified.

The following document, bearing the endorsement of Hon. Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State, Francis Lynde Stetson, George C. Holt, Judge United States District Court, William D. Howells, Ida M. Tarbell, Alden Chester, ex-Justice Supreme Court, New York, Jane Addams, Marcus M. Marks, President National Association of Clothiers, Samuel B. Capen, President A. B. C. F. M., Bishop C. P. Anderson, N. O. Nelson, George Foster Peabody, Henry Wade Rogers, Dean of Yale Law School, David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University, W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University, Thomas Mott Osborne, and many others, was issued on January 16, and copies of it sent to every member of Congress :

"Neutralization means mutual agreement among nations that a specified region shall be always neutral in a war between other states, and that its own immunity from attack or from warlike action of belligerents be guaranteed.

"The Panama Canal should not be fortified :

"1. *Because* the canal would be safer in wartime without fortification. According to the agreement signed by the Hague Conference in 1907, unfortified coast places cannot be bombarded.

"2. *Because* the original intention of our government, as distinctly expressed in 1900, and previously, was to prohibit fortifications on the canal. Though this prohibition was omitted in the finally revised Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, signed in 1902, this in no wise implies that we ought to fortify it, nor was its construction proposed as primarily a military undertaking.

"3. *Because*, though the Suez Canal was built with English money, England agreed to its neutralization. The Straits of Magellan are also neutralized, and the

Interparliamentary Union in 1910 declared in favor of the neutralization of all interoceanic waterways.

"4. *Because* the United States in all its history has never been attacked, and began every foreign war it ever had, and is too important a customer for any great nation at this late day to wantonly attack. Though an enemy might in stress of war be tempted to break its pledge with us, no nation would dare break its neutralization pledge with the combined powers, as the penalty of non-intercourse, which could be included in the general treaty, would involve commercial ruin.

5. *"Because*, with the experience of nearly a century's peace with England, insured by our undefended Canadian border line, *until we have asked for complete arbitration treaties with all possible future enemies and have been refused*, we should be insincere in increasing our war measures. This is especially true in view of the facts that since 1902 the nations have signed one hundred arbitration treaties, and President Taft has made the impressive declaration that he sees no reason why any question whatever should not be arbitrated; that the second Hague Conference in various ways diminished the likelihood of war; that not only the Prize Court, but the Court of Arbitral Justice, is practically assured; and that in the summer of 1910 Congress unanimously passed a resolution asking the President to appoint a commission of five to consider the utilization of existing agencies to limit the armaments of the world by mutual agreement of the nations and to constitute the world navies 'an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider other means to diminish expenditures for military purposes.'

6. *"Because*, in the words of Hon. David J. Foster, chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives: 'The initial expense of the necessary fortifications would not be less than \$25,000,000; in all probability it would not be less than \$50,000,000. The annual expense of maintaining such fortifications two thousand miles from home would probably amount to \$5,000,000. . . . With all the fortifications possible, it is still apparent that, in order that the canal might be of military advantage to the United States in time of war, a guard of battleships at each of its entrances would be an absolute necessity. It is equally apparent that with such a guard the fortifications would be unnecessary, if not entirely useless. . . . We are bound by solemn treaty obligations to see to it that the canal shall be, and remain forever, open to British ships in time of war as well as in time of peace; and while it is probably true that no other nation could claim any advantage by virtue of this treaty, it is also true that we have thereby placed ourselves under moral obligation to maintain an open canal for the ships of all nations at all times, in war as well as in peace.'

Cooper Union Resolution.

At the close of the meeting held in Cooper Union, New York, on January 13, under the auspices of the New York Peace Society and the People's Institute, and addressed by Hon. David J. Foster and Hon. James A. Tawney, the following resolution, addressed to President Taft, was adopted and forwarded to him and also afterwards to all the members of Congress :

"In view of the fact that the civilized world is united today as never before, by reason of quick transmission of news,

interdependence in commerce and finance, because of common intellectual interests, democratic ideals and the existence of international organizations, unions, bureaus and other institutions which are doing their work irrespective of national boundaries, and which tend to make international war hateful, unprofitable and (unless provoked by armaments) unlikely to occur; in view, also, of the gigantic cost of maintaining an armed peace that has brought Europe to the verge of bankruptcy, is hindering the material and social development of America and even threatens to overwhelm in blood the civilization which has been so long maturing; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the President and Congress of the United States, in dealing with other nations, to depend as little as possible upon the show and use of force, and as much as possible upon reason, goodwill and justice; and that we especially ask that the people's money shall not be wasted in building and maintaining fortifications on the Panama Canal until our method of neutralization has first been tried and failed, and that addition shall not be made to the present strength of our navy until inclusive arbitration treaties have been offered to all the great nations and have been refused by them."

Charles Sumner and the Peace Cause.

At the recent celebration in Boston, on January 6, of the centennial of the birth of Charles Sumner, at which the various aspects of Sumner's great work were commemorated by various speakers, Edwin D. Mead, at the afternoon meeting in Park Street Church, treated Sumner's lifelong service for the cause of international peace.

Mr. Mead expressed his profound gratitude that Park Street Church, with its noble spire pointing to heaven, still stands by Boston Common. There, he said, may it ever stand; and as the years go on may it become the place of many meetings as influential in the cause of righteousness as the illustrious meetings which have been held within its walls in the past! Hardly had the church been reared when it received a new consecration by having sung within it for the first time the beautiful hymn, "My Country 'tis of Thee," which has become the dearest of all our national hymns to the popular heart. That hymn sang of our country as the "sweet land of liberty" at a time when the country was half free and half slave; but it truly expressed the Republic's ideal, and truly prophesied the thing which should be.

Here in 1829, on the Fourth of July, Garrison made his first speech in Boston in his war against slavery; and here twenty years later, in 1849, Charles Sumner made his greatest speech in his lifelong war against war. There stand in Boston statues of Sumner, Garrison, Andrew, Horace Mann, Channing and Theodore Parker. Every one of these great warriors against slavery was a warrior against war. When the International Peace Congress was held in Boston in 1904, the foreign delegates went to Mt. Auburn and laid wreaths upon the graves of Sumner, Channing, Noah Worcester, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes and Phillips Brooks, the seven great apostles of peace whose bodies rest there. They might have gone to Concord and laid a wreath upon the grave of Emerson; and they might have gone to Amesbury and laid a wreath upon the grave of Whittier. All of these men were active workers in the peace cause, which has become the commanding cause of our own time, as most of them were active in the anti-slavery cause, which was the specially commanding cause of their generation. Mr. Carnegie has rightly said that, as the great duty of Lincoln's generation was to put a stop to man-selling, so the great duty of our generation is to put a stop to man-killing. These

two great causes of human rights go together; and as we commemorate to-day the greatest champion of anti-slavery in the Senate, we remember with gratitude and honor that he was also the greatest champion in his day of the cause of peace and the better organization of the world. The one cause, like the other, occupied his earnest thought and devotion during his whole manhood. It was indeed in the interest of the peace cause, and not in that of anti-slavery, that he began his public career, with his famous Fourth of July oration at Tremont Temple, in 1845, upon "The True Grandeur of Nations." The true grandeur of nations, he said powerfully to Boston and the country on that occasion, lies not in its roll of "famous victories," with their terrible harvest of slaughtered men, but in national service for the brotherhood of nations and the welfare of humanity.

In 1849, here in Park Street Church, he delivered his second great address upon the cause, the address entitled "The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations," an address yet more thorough and powerful than the first. His service for the cause continued untiringly. In 1870 came the searching address, delivered in many places in the country, upon "The Duel between France and Germany," in which he showed that wars are simply the duels of nations, and destined, like the duels between men, to give place to the judicial settlement of quarrels in the courts, as soon as nations become truly civilized. It is not too much to say that Charles Sumner's great addresses upon war and peace remain the most powerful impeachment of the war system in brief which even to-day is to be found in the libraries. When he died he bequeathed \$1,000 to Harvard University for an annual prize for the best essay by a student of the University upon the legal methods of superseding war. He emphasized in this the great importance of the education of our people to ideas of international peace and justice. Let us, on this great anniversary, devote ourselves anew to the information and training of our people in the noble principles for which Sumner stood his whole life long.

One Peril of the New Peace Movement.

BY PROF. WILLIAM I. HULL, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

When a ship which has traversed an uncharted ocean is finishing her voyage and entering some unknown port, it behooves her captain, pilot and crew to be especially watchful lest at any moment she strike her prow upon some hidden reef. So it is with the peace movement of our time. Its advocates have seen it sail so swiftly within the past dozen years over such notable leagues of progress that its haven already looms ahead and the lower lights are seen upon the shore. But between its present position and its promised haven there lie perils which must be avoided if the voyage is not to end in shipwreck or be deflected far down the coast or back to sea. Eternal vigilance must ever be the price of genuine and lasting success.

The peril of the peace movement which it is the design of this brief article to signalize is the strong and growing desire to throw overboard the principle of the equality of sovereign states. This principle has been regarded as an essential plank in the ship which has borne the family of nations from the *De jure belli ac pacis* of Hugo Grotius to the second Conference at The Hague.